1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** \* \* \* 6 7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 8 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:11-cr-00094-KJD-CWH 2:15-cv-00526-KJD-CWH 9 v. **ORDER** 10 ADAM BRENT WALLACE, 11 Defendant. 12 13 Before the Court is Defendant Adam Brent Wallace's Motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to 14 Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody (#144). Also before the 15 Court is Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (#146). Defendant also filed a Motion 16 to Dismiss for Failure to State an Offense (#147) which the Court will construe as another 17 § 2255 motion. The Government filed a response in opposition (#148) to which Defendant has replied (#149). The Court recognizes that Defendant is *pro se*, and has construed his pleadings 18 19 liberally. 20 I. Background 21 In 2011, Defendant pleaded guilty to receipt of child pornography (#21/22). The district 22 court subsequently sentenced Defendant to 97 months' imprisonment followed by a lifetime of 23 supervised release (#31). Defendant filed a § 2255 motion (#53), which the district court denied 24 (#66). Later, Defendant filed the present motions. 25 /// 26 ///

| 1  | II. Analysis   |
|----|--|
| 2  | A) Defendant's Motions to Vacate under U.S.C. § 2255 (#144/147)  |
| 3  | This is Defendant's second and third § 2255 motions filed with this Court. 28 U.S.C.   |
| 4  | § 2255 provides that:  |
| 5  | (h) A second or successive motion must be certified as provided in section 2244  |
| 6  | by a panel of the appropriate court of appeals to contain—   |
| 7  | (1) newly discovered evidence that, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing |
| 8  | evidence that no reasonable factfinder would have found the movant guilty of the offense; or   |
| 9  | (2) a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral  |
| 10 | review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable.  |
| 11 | The Ninth Circuit has not certified any second or successive motions. Consequently, this Court   |
| 12 | must deny Defendant's § 2255 motions.  |
| 13 | B) Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (#146)  |
| 14 | Defendant has no right to further counsel. As explained in Pennsylvania v. Finley, 481   |
| 15 | U.S. 555 (1987)  |
| 16 | [T]he right to appointed counsel extends to the first appeal of right, and no  |
| 17 | further. Thus, we have rejected suggestions that we establish a right to counsel on discretionary appeals. Wainwright v. Torna, 455 U. S. 586          |
| 18 | (1982); Ross v. Moffitt, 417 U. S. 600 (1974). We think that, since a defendant has no federal constitutional right to counsel when pursuing a         |
| 19 | discretionary appeal on direct review of his conviction, a fortiori he has no such right when attacking a conviction that has long since become final  |
| 20 | upon exhaustion of the appellate process. See Boyd v. Dutton, 405 U. S. 1,   |
| 21 | 405 U. S. 7, n. 2 (1972) (POWELL, J., dissenting).   |
| 22 | However, an indigent petitioner seeking relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 may move the   |
| 23 | court for appointment of representation to pursue that relief. 18 U.S.C. § 3006(A)(2)(B). The  |
| 24 | court has discretion to appoint counsel when the interest of justice so requires. 18 U.S.C. §  |
| 25 | 3006(A)(2). The interest of justice so requires where the complexities of the case are such that   |
| 26 | denial of counsel would amount to a denial of due process. See Brown v. United States, 623 F.2d  |

## Case 2:11-cr-00094-KJD-CWH Document 150 Filed 07/02/15 Page 3 of 3

| 1  | 54, 61 (9th Cir. 1980). Here, the Court has reviewed the documents and pleading on file in this      |
|----|--|
| 2  | matter and finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted. Defendant's only recourse is to       |
| 3  | obtain an order from the appropriate court of appeals authorizing the district court to consider the |
| 4  | motion. See Rule 9, Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings. Therefore, the Court denies                  |
| 5  | Defendant's Motion to Appoint Counsel.   |
| 6  | III. Conclusion  |
| 7  | Accordingly, it is <b>HEREBY ORDERED</b> that Defendant's Motions under 28 U.S.C. §                  |
| 8  | 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody (#144/147) are         |
| 9  | DENIED;  |
| 10 | IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant is DENIED a certificate of appealability;                       |
| 11 | IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel                             |
| 12 | (#146) is <b>DENIED</b> .  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 | DATED this <u>2nd</u> day of July 2015.  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | Level 1  |
| 17 | Kent J. Dawson   |
| 18 | United States District Judge   |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |